



SPP- MISO Coordinated System Plan Study Stakeholder Feedback Request Questions

Response From: Organization of MISO States (OMS) Transmission Planning Work Group
Date: November 13, 2015

SPP and MISO, in preparation for the December 2 Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee (IPSAC) meeting, are requesting feedback from stakeholders regarding the process utilized for the SPP-MISO Coordinated System Plan (CSP) study.

*Please submit any feedback by **November 13, 2015** to Jenell McKay (jmckay@misoenergy.org) or SPP Interregional Relations (interregionalrelations@spp.org).*

1. *What do you think worked well during the MISO-SPP Coordinated System Plan (CSP) Study?*

For a first organized attempt, the CSP went well. While there are always improvements, generally the following items went well:

Requesting a list of potential interregional issues from stakeholders as the first portion of the CSP process;

Producing results in a manner that was easily understood, in terms of adjusted production cost benefits always split up between SPP and MISO, etc.;

The date the models were locked down was clearly announced;

The initial screening of economic projects using a lower B/C ratio than 1.25 was helpful to have more projects discussed.

The screening of economic projects below 345 kV was appreciated, even though those projects are not currently eligible for regional cost allocation through the MISO regional review process; and

The willingness to look at projects that produced economic benefits in one RTO and reliability benefits in the other RTO.

2. *What do you think needs improvement for the next coordinated study between MISO and SPP?*

A potential improvement would be to solve the reliability conundrum – which is how to timely identify interregional potential solutions to reliability issues that are potentially superior to regional reliability solutions. It has proven difficult with the first 18 month process to find reliability solutions needed far enough ahead of time that are not being simultaneously addressed within the regional processes.



A second potential improvement is to discuss properly and in a timely fashion at IPSAC meetings when needs identified in the interregional process have solutions either (1) being discussed in the current SPP and/or MISO regional plans; and/or have already been approved in concurrent regional plans. There was little to no discussion of the SPP Iatan-Stranger Creek project approved in January 2015 within the SPP regional process competing for benefits with the NSUB project that was later approved within the CSP process.

Additional potential improvements include:

The cost estimating of lines within the CSP process. The information used by MISO to estimate line costs within the CSP process needs to be updated;

Breaking down benefit information by state / zone / utility;

Finding a manner to produce more MISO stakeholder involvement – the majority of the participants, especially in person, were SPP stakeholders; and

Producing and publishing results and benefits for Tier 1 entities (AECI, TVA, etc.) within the process. If each interregional process only looks at two planning regions, it will be very difficult to identify solutions in areas involving three planning areas.

3. *How well did the scope of the study capture the transmission needs on/near the MISO-SPP seam?*

The study scope did this fairly well, as there was an open submission process for needs.

4. *Do you feel there were an adequate number of IPSAC meetings and opportunities for stakeholders to be involved?*

Yes, however, there could be additional technical task teams that could meet in between IPSAC meetings.

5. *Do you think the current procedures outlined in the MISO-SPP JOA adequately capture items to be included in a coordinated study between MISO and SPP?*

Please see our response to Question #2. It is difficult to identify potential interregional projects due to how the interregional process synchs up with the MISO and SPP regional processes.

6. *Do you think the use of one joint model was effective for the MISO-SPP CSP study?*

The use of one joint model was effective.

7. *Do you think the one BAU future was adequate for evaluating potential interregional solutions?*



Please see our answer to Question #2. There could be a benefit to doing multiple futures. For example, some version of the Clean Power Plan as a future, BAU or otherwise. It may be helpful to have a limited screen of some potential interregional projects through the most recent SPP and MISO regional review processes.

8. *Was using historical and projected congestion appropriate for determining top congested flowgates (ie. the economic issues list)?*

For the first CSP, yes, this was appropriate.

9. *Do you agree with the process as designed by SPP and MISO stakeholders that begins with a coordinated study of up to 18 months followed by two separate regional analyses?*

Yes.

10. *Do you feel the criteria in the MISO-SPP JOA are appropriate for an Interregional Project?*

The goal of the criteria should be to (1) identify potentially valuable interregional projects.

There may be significant benefit to identifying all valuable potential interregional projects, even if they do not have established paths to approval within MISO and SPP. This process can create possibilities for "one off" negotiations to get projects built between RTOs, utilities, and/or other market participants.

The interregional criteria for reliability projects makes it very difficult for those projects to be identified as necessary within the CSP. Additional work should be done on the screening criteria to see if interregional reliability projects can be better identified.

The interregional criteria for economic projects are appropriate. To the extent projects are identified that parties may wish to build outside the regional cost allocation processes, it may be helpful to identify all potential interregional economic projects with a B/C ratio above 1.0 within the report.

11. *Do you have suggestions for marrying the ongoing separate regional analyses and the coordination efforts of the CPP analyses?*

At this time, we are still discussing possible solutions to this effort.

There is a concern that if a project is approved outside the MISO MTEP process or towards the end of the year that the project would either (1) need to go through the "out of cycle" process; or (2) wait until the end of the year to be approved. The use of additional futures within the CSP process, or utilizing recent MISO and SPP futures for screening, may lead to more predictability about whether a project would survive the MISO and SPP regional processes for established cost allocation criteria.